

REMARKS

Claim 12 is pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-11 are canceled and by this Amendment, claim 12 is amended to change "subcharacter pixel" to "subpixel" and "subpixel" to "character pixel," where appropriate, for clarity.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,542,161 to Koyama et al. (Koyama) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,9145,615 to Okada et al. (Okada) and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0020729 to Toji et al. (Toji).

By this Amendment, claims 1-11 are canceled. Thus, the rejection as to these claims is moot.

Claim 12 recites a font processor adapted to compare selected character pixels of font data, i.e., a target character pixel and selected neighboring character pixels, against an ordered set of criteria. Based on which criteria is matched, the target pixel is shifted one way or another, or not, and expanded into subpixels. The order of comparison is (1) if a character pixel is adjacent to the target pixel in a first direction, (2) if a character pixel is adjacent to the target character pixel in a second direction orthogonal to the first direction, or (3) if a character pixel is adjacent and diagonal to the target character pixel. If conditions (1) or (2) are met, the target pixel is not shifted. If condition (3) is met, the target pixel is shifted.

As discussed in the September 11 Amendment, Koyama does not disclose matching character pixels diagonal to a target pixel. Further, Koyama fails to disclose an apparatus which is adapted to successively compare a target character pixel and selected neighboring pixels to multiple different criteria as recited in claim 12.

Toji requires that the eight neighboring pixels of a target pixel must be matched to a pattern, e.g., all pixels shown in Fig. 14b other than the target pixel (paragraph [0298]). Thus, Toji fails to disclose an apparatus which is adapted to successively compare a target

character pixel and selected neighboring pixels to multiple different criteria as recited in claim 12 in order to determine whether to shift the target pixel. Additionally, because Toji matches all eight neighboring pixels to a target pixel, Toji has no need, and would derive no benefit from, successively matching additional patterns to the target pixel and eight neighboring pixels. Okada fails to cure these deficiencies.

For the foregoing reasons, in addition to the arguments made in the September 11 Amendment, claim 12 is patentable over the applied references. Thus, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claim 12 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/dks

Date: October 13, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--